
CHAPTER 3

Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

3.A Impact Overview

This subsequent environmental impact report (SEIR) chapter provides a project-level impact analysis of the potentially significant, physical environmental impacts of implementing the Balboa Reservoir project (proposed project) as described in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. The chapter focuses on those topics that were identified in the initial study (see SEIR Appendix B) with the potential to have either new significant effects or substantially more severe significant impacts than were previously identified in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan [Program] Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) due to implementation of the currently proposed project. Topics for which no new or more significant impacts were identified in the initial study are not analyzed in this chapter. Following this SEIR Section 3.A are Sections 3.B through 3.D, each presenting the impact analysis for the key resource topics identified in the initial study, as described below. Sections 3.B through 3.D each includes descriptions of the environmental setting and regulatory framework; assessments of project impacts (i.e., offsite, onsite, construction-related, operational, direct, and indirect impacts) and cumulative impacts; and identification of mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid identified significant environmental impacts.

This section describes the scope of analysis in the initial study and this SEIR and explains the format and basis for the impact analysis for all resource topics, including the cumulative impact analysis.

3.A.1 Scope of Analysis

Initial Study

As described in SEIR Chapter 1, Introduction, the San Francisco Planning Department (the planning department) determined that an EIR is required for the proposed project in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and published a notice of preparation (NOP) (see SEIR Appendix A). As part of the preparation of this SEIR, the planning department identified several resource topics that could be adequately addressed in an initial study and determined that many of the topics were adequately analyzed in the PEIR such that the proposed project would have no new significant impacts or no substantially more severe significant impacts than those previously found significant. In some cases, the initial study identified

mitigation measures in these topic areas that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level to support the determination that under these resource areas, the proposed project would have no new significant impacts or no substantially more severe significant impacts than those previously identified in the PEIR. Therefore, the topics addressed in the initial study are listed below and are not analyzed in this SEIR chapter.¹ Also shown are abbreviations for each resource topic that are used in the naming of impact statements and mitigation measures:

- Section E.1: Land Use and Land Use Planning (LU)
- Section E.2: Aesthetics (AE)
- Section E.3: Population and Housing (PH)
- Section E.4: Cultural Resources (CR)
- Section E.5: Tribal Cultural Resources (TC)
- Section E.9: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GG)
- Section E.10: Wind (WI)
- Section E.11: Shadow (SH)
- Section E.12: Recreation (RE)
- Section E.13: Utilities and Services Systems (UT)
- Section E.14: Public Services (PS)
- Section E.15: Biological Resources (BI)
- Section E.16: Geology and Soils (GE)
- Section E.17: Hydrology and Water Quality (HY)
- Section E.18: Hazards and Hazardous Materials (HZ)
- Section E.19: Mineral Resources (MR)
- Section E.20: Energy (EN)
- Section E.21: Agriculture and Forest Resources (AG)
- Section E.22: Wildfire (WF)

Refer to the initial study in SEIR Appendix B for a discussion and the impact analysis of the proposed project with respect to these resource topics.

¹ As described in SEIR Chapter 1, Introduction, and in the initial study, impacts related to aesthetics are not analyzed in this initial study or this SEIR because, under CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21099), aesthetics impacts of a mixed-use or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area are not to be considered significant impacts; therefore, no impact analysis is required.

SEIR Topics

The resource topic areas addressed in this SEIR chapter are listed below, and the abbreviations for each resource topic that are used in the naming of impact statements and mitigation measures are shown in parentheses:

- Section 3.B: Transportation and Circulation (TR)
- Section 3.C: Noise (NO)
- Section 3.D: Air Quality (AQ)

Aesthetics and Parking Analysis

CEQA section 21099(d) states that “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site located within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.”² Accordingly, aesthetics and parking are not considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects for projects that meet all of the following three criteria:

1. The project is in a transit priority area;³
2. The project is on an infill site;⁴ and
3. The project is residential, mixed-use residential,⁵ or an employment center.⁶

The two proposed project options and the project variants all meet each of the above three criteria because the project site is (1) located within 0.5 mile of several Municipal Railway (Muni) transit lines and the Balboa Park Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station; (2) located on an infill site that is developed as surface parking, and adjacent to residential and mixed uses; and (3) would include residential, retail, and community center and childcare uses meeting the definition of a mixed-use residential project.⁷ Thus, this SEIR does not consider aesthetics and the adequacy of parking in determining the significance of project impacts under CEQA.

² Refer to CEQA section 21099(d)(1).

³ CEQA section 21099(a)(7) defines a *transit priority area* as an area within 0.5 mile of an existing or planned major transit stop. A “major transit stop” is defined in CEQA section 21064.3 as a rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

⁴ CEQA section 21099(a)(4) defines an *infill site* as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed, or a vacant site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins, or is *separated* only by an improved public right-of-way from, parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses.

⁵ CEQA section 21159.28(d) defines a *mixed-use residential* project as a project where at least 75 percent of the total building square footage of the project consists of residential use or a project that is a transit priority project as defined in CEQA section 21155. CEQA section 21155 defines *transit priority project* as a project that (1) contains at least 50 percent residential use, based on total building square footage and, if the project contains between 26 percent and 50 percent nonresidential uses, a floor-area ratio of not less than 0.75; (2) provides a minimum net density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre; and (3) is within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan.

⁶ CEQA section 21099(a)(1) defines an *employment center* as a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor-area ratio of no less than 0.75 and located within a transit priority area.

⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, *Eligibility Checklist: CEQA Section 21099—Modernization of Transportation Analysis, Balboa Reservoir Project*, November 15, 2018.

CEQA section 21099(e) states that a lead agency may consider aesthetic impacts under local design review ordinances or other discretionary powers and that aesthetics impacts do not include impacts on historical or cultural resources. Therefore, there is no change in the planning department's methodology related to design review or impacts on historical resources.

The planning department recognizes that the public and decision makers nonetheless may be interested in information pertaining to the aesthetic effects of a proposed project, and may desire that such information be provided as part of the environmental review process. Therefore, some of the information that would have otherwise been provided in an aesthetics section of an EIR (such as visual depictions of the proposed project) is included in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. However, this information is provided solely for informational purposes and is not used to determine the significance of the environmental impacts of the project, pursuant to CEQA.

Similarly, the planning department acknowledges that parking conditions may be of interest to the public and the decision makers. Therefore, the initial study presents secondary environmental impacts related to City College in Appendix B, Initial Study, Section E.14, Public Services.

Automobile Delay and Vehicle Miles Traveled

CEQA section 21099(b)(1) requires that the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) develop revisions to the CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects that promote the "reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses." CEQA section 21099(b)(2) states that upon certification of the revised CEQA Guidelines for determining transportation impacts under CEQA section 21099(b)(1), automobile delay, as described solely by *level of service* or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

In January 2016, OPR published for public review and comment a *Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Proposed Transportation Impact Guidelines) recommending that transportation impacts for projects be measured using a *vehicle miles traveled* (VMT) metric. VMT measures the amount and distance that a project might cause people to drive, accounting for the number of passengers within a vehicle. These proposed transportation impact guidelines provide substantial evidence that VMT is an appropriate standard to use in analyzing transportation impacts to protect environmental quality and a better indicator of GHG, air quality, and energy impacts than automobile delay. Acknowledging this, San Francisco Planning Commission resolution 19579, was issued on March 3, 2016, which:

- Found that automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall no longer be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant to CEQA, because it does not measure environmental impacts and therefore it does not protect environmental quality.
- Directed the Environmental Review Officer to remove automobile delay as a factor in determining significant impacts under CEQA for all guidelines, criteria, and list of

exemptions, and to update the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review and Categorical Exemptions from CEQA to reflect this change.

- Directed the Environmental Planning Division and Environmental Review Officer to replace automobile delay with VMT criteria, which promote the reduction of GHG emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses; and consistent with proposed and forthcoming changes to the CEQA Guidelines by the OPR.

Planning commission resolution 19579 became effective immediately for all projects that had not received a CEQA determination and all projects that had previously received CEQA determinations but require additional environmental analysis. In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the CEQA Guidelines update package, including the Guidelines section implementing Senate Bill 743 (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3). Accordingly, this SEIR does not contain a discussion of automobile delay impacts based on level of service criteria. Instead, a VMT and induced automobile travel impact analysis is provided in SEIR Section 3.B, Transportation and Circulation. Nonetheless, automobile delay may be considered by decision makers, independent of the environmental review process, as part of their decision to approve, modify, or disapprove the proposed project.

Comment [WW(1)]: To answer your question in response to my comment on ADEIR-1: yes, we discussed keeping the non-CEQA studies out of the SEIR. I don't see any problem though mentioning here, just once, that those non-CEQA studies exist. Please let me know if you disagree.

3.A.2 Overall Approach to Impact Analysis

The impact analysis for all resource topics is based on the detailed, project-specific information presented in SEIR Chapter 2, Project Description. The analysis includes consideration of environmental impacts associated with both construction and operation of the proposed project. Construction-related activities would be confined within the duration of the construction period. Operational impacts would cover the long-term effects associated with the full use of the project structures and features following completion of construction.

As described in SEIR Chapter 1, Introduction, this SEIR is a project-level EIR that is tiered from a previously certified program-level EIR, namely the PEIR. As a project-level EIR and consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15125(a), the impact analysis is generally based on potential physical effects of the project compared to existing or baseline conditions of the physical environment at the project site at the time of publication of the NOP, which was in October 2018.

As a subsequent EIR to the PEIR certified in 2008, this SEIR, including the initial study, identifies and considers all mitigation measures that were identified in the PEIR and determines their applicability to the currently proposed project. In some cases, mitigation measures have already been implemented, either in their entirety or in part, in which case those measures are considered part of the existing conditions. Otherwise, the impact analysis in this SEIR, including the initial study, does not assume that all mitigation measures from the PEIR would be implemented as part of the proposed project. Instead, this SEIR and initial study impact analysis determines if the mitigation measures from the PEIR would apply to the proposed project and would still be considered appropriate, in which case those PEIR mitigation measures are reiterated and modified to reflect latest standards or the conditions of the project as project-level mitigation measures for the proposed project. SEIR Appendix H lists all of the mitigation measures from the PEIR and indicates which measures are applicable to the proposed project.

In addition, because this SEIR is also a subsequent EIR to the PEIR, the impact analysis also considers the following:

- changes in the CEQA Guidelines since the PEIR was certified in 2008;
- whether the proposed project includes substantial changes from what was analyzed in the PEIR;
- whether substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken compared to what was assumed in the PEIR; and,
- whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time of certification of the PEIR, would affect the impact analysis.

Thus, the project impacts are also analyzed with regard to the potential for the proposed project to contribute to *new* significant impacts or substantially *more severe* significant impacts than those identified as significant in the PEIR.

3.A.3 Organization of the Impact Analyses

Each of the resource areas in this chapter includes the following elements:

- **Introduction.** This section summarizes the applicable topic analysis and its relevance to the proposed project.
- **Summary of the PEIR Section.** This section summarizes how the topic was addressed in the PEIR as it related to the Balboa Reservoir site, including identifying any applicable mitigation measures from the PEIR and conclusions reached regarding significance of effects.
- **Environmental Setting.** This section describes the existing physical conditions of the project site and surroundings relevant to that resource topic when the NOP was issued on October 10, 2018, in sufficient detail and breadth to allow a general understanding of and basis for the environmental impacts of the proposed project.
- **Regulatory Framework.** This section describes the relevant federal, state, and local regulatory requirements that are directly applicable to the environmental topic being analyzed.
- **Impacts and Mitigation Measures.** This section evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in adverse effects on the physical environment described in the setting. It identifies the significance of each impact (see definitions below) based on topic-specific significance criteria. For impacts determined to be significant, the impact analysis identifies feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce the severity of the identified impact. The analysis describes all mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project, whether they are the same as those specified in the PEIR, are updated measures, or new mitigation measures. The project sponsor—Reservoir Community Partners LLC—has reviewed the identified mitigation measures and has agreed to implement them if the project is approved.

The “Impacts and Mitigation Measures” section is further subdivided into the following:

- **Significance Criteria.** This section lists the criteria specific to each resource topic used to identify and determine significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Under CEQA, a significant effect is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment. The guidelines implementing CEQA direct that this determination be based on scientific and factual data, including the entire record for the project, and not on argument, speculation, or unsubstantiated evidence. The significance

criteria used in this EIR are based on planning department guidance used to assess the severity of environmental impacts of the proposed project. It is based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, with procedures as set forth in San Francisco Administrative Code chapter 31.10.

- **Approach to Analysis.** This section describes the general approach and methodology used to apply the significance thresholds in evaluating the impacts of the project. The methodology for applying significance criteria provides the basis for the impact analysis, which could be either qualitative or quantitative, depending on the specific impact. The methodology identifies use of applicable regulatory guidelines, thresholds, standards, or accepted professional practices or protocols used to assess construction, operational, and cumulative impacts.
- **Impact Evaluation.** This section presents the project-specific analyses of impacts of the proposed project, with specific impact areas discussed under individually numbered impact statements. Each of the numbered impact statements is followed by a discussion and analysis of the various components of the proposed project with potential for physical environmental effects. The conclusion of each impact analysis is expressed in terms of the impact significance, which is discussed below. For significant or potentially significant impacts, the impact discussion identifies feasible mitigation measures, numbered corresponding to the impact number. In some cases, for impacts determined to be less than significant, improvement measures are recommended to reduce or avoid impacts. Unlike mitigation measures, implementation of improvement measures is not required under CEQA because they only apply to impacts determined to be less than significant. However, as stated above, all improvement measures identified in this SEIR would be incorporated into conditions of approval if the project is approved. The numbering of the mitigation and improvement measures corresponds with the number of the impact statement to which the measure applies, with a prefix of “M” or “I” for mitigation and improvement measures, respectively.

Following the impact evaluation, there is a qualitative comparison of the impact conclusions in this SEIR with the comparable impact conclusion from the PEIR.

- **Cumulative Impacts** considers the effects of the proposed project together with potential effects of other reasonably foreseeable future projects within the same geographic scope as the project’s impacts. The analysis of cumulative impacts under each resource topic is based on the same setting, regulatory framework, and significance thresholds as the direct impacts. Additional mitigation measures are identified if the analysis determines that the project’s contribution to a cumulative, adverse impact would be considerable (i.e., significant). The overall assumptions to the cumulative impact analysis for all topics are described in SEIR Section 3.A.6, Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis, p. 3.A-8.

3.A.4 Significance Determinations

For each impact statement and analysis, the impact evaluation provides a conclusion of the impact significance, which is designated as one of the following:

- **No Impact.** This determination is reached if there is no potential for impacts or the environmental resource does not occur within the project area or the area of potential effects.
- **Less-than-Significant Impact.** This determination applies if the impact does not exceed the defined significance criterion or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations. No mitigation is required for impacts determined to be less than significant.

- **Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation.** This determination applies if the project would or could result in a significant or potentially significant adverse effect when evaluated with respect to one or more significance criteria, but feasible mitigation is available that would effectively reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact with Mitigation.** This determination applies if the project would result in a significant adverse effect that exceeds the defined significance criterion, and although feasible mitigation might lessen the severity of the impact, the residual impact would still exceed the defined significance criteria. Thus, even with implementation of feasible mitigation, the impact would be significant, and therefore, unavoidable.
- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact.** This determination applies if the project would result in a significant adverse effect that exceeds the defined significance criterion, and there is no feasible mitigation available to lessen the severity of the impact. Therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

3.A.5 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are identified in each resource topic, where feasible, for impacts considered significant consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, which states that an EIR “shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts.” CEQA requires that a mitigation measure has an essential nexus and be roughly proportional to the significant effect identified in the EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, mitigation measures are not required for environmental impacts that are not found to be significant.

3.A.6 Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis

CEQA Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative impacts, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15355, refer to two or more individual effects that, when taken together, are “considerable” or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. A cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that would result from the incremental impact of the project added to the impacts of other reasonably foreseeable future projects. Pertinent guidance for cumulative impact analysis is provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15130:

- An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable” (e.g., the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects, including those outside the control of the lead agency, if necessary).
- An EIR should not discuss impacts that do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.
- A project’s contribution is less than cumulatively considerable, and thus not significant, if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.
- The discussion of impact severity and likelihood of occurrence need not be as detailed as for effects attributable to the project alone.

- The focus of analysis should be on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute, rather than on attributes of the other projects that do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

Approach to Cumulative Impact Analysis

The cumulative impact analysis for each individual resource topic is described in each section of this chapter, immediately following the description of the direct project impacts and identified mitigation measures. Cumulative impacts are numbered sequentially, starting with the number "1" and preceded by "C-" (such as "Impact C-TR-1" for the first cumulative transportation impact).

Similar to the project impacts, cumulative impacts are also analyzed with regard to the potential for the proposed project to contribute to new significant cumulative impacts or substantially more severe cumulative impacts than those identified as significant in the PEIR. The PEIR used the year 2025 for the analysis of the buildout of the plan area as well as for the cumulative impacts analysis, and cumulative impacts were assessed on the basis of regional population and employment projections for the year 2025 as determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Two approaches to a cumulative impact analysis are provided in CEQA Guidelines section 15130(b)(1): (a) the analysis can be based on a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts; or (b) a summary of projections contained in a general plan or related planning document can be used to determine cumulative impacts. The projections model includes individual projects and applies a quantitative growth factor to account for other growth that may occur in the area.

The analyses in this SEIR, including the initial study, employ both the list-based approach and a projections-based approach, depending on which approach best suits the individual resource topic being analyzed. For instance, the land use analysis in Appendix B, Initial Study, Section E.1, Land Use and Land Use Planning, considers individual projects that are anticipated in the project site vicinity that may alter land use conditions in the area. By comparison, the cumulative ~~transportation and circulation vehicle miles traveled~~ analysis relies on a citywide growth projection model that also encompasses and other reasonably foreseeable projects, which is the typical methodology the planning department applies to analysis of ~~transportation-these~~ impacts.

For the list-based approach, projects or plans that are relevant to the cumulative analysis include those that could contribute incremental effects on the same environmental resources and would have similar environmental impacts as those discussed in this SEIR. The following factors were used to determine an appropriate list of projects to be considered in the near-term cumulative impact analysis:

- **Similar Environmental Impacts.** A relevant project contributes to effects on resources that are also affected by the proposed project. A relevant future project or plan is defined as one that is "reasonably foreseeable," such as a proposed project for which an application has been filed with the approving agency or has approved funding, or an approved plan that amended the land use controls applicable to an adjacent neighborhood.

- **Geographic Scope and Location.** A relevant project is located within the defined geographic scope for the cumulative effect.
- **Timing and Duration of Implementation.** Effects associated with activities for a relevant project (e.g., short-term construction or demolition, or long-term operations) would likely coincide in timing with the effects of the proposed project.

For the resource topics using the list-based approach, **Table 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects within a 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site**, presents a comprehensive list of cumulative development projects generally located within 0.5 mile of the project site that are considered in the various cumulative analyses. The table identifies cumulative projects and their status as of the date of the NOP (October 10, 2018), and provides a figure key, **Figure 3.A-1, Cumulative Projects within a 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site**, which shows the location of these projects relative to the proposed project site. In order to differentiate the status of these projects at the time of the NOP, the table includes a column to list each project's status. In general, these cumulative projects are either under construction, which means they were "under construction" at the date of the NOP; "building permit approved," meaning the project has permits necessary to start construction but has not yet started construction; and "under environmental review," in which case, the project has an application on file with the planning department.

Each cumulative impact analysis considers the projects listed in Table 3.A-1 as appropriate to the resource topic. Two reasonably foreseeable projects are identified for the City College of San Francisco Ocean Campus. As an agency of the state, City College of San Francisco is not required to comply with the local zoning ordinances, regulations, and ordinances of a county or city.⁸ Differences in applicable regulations for the City College projects are described in the cumulative impact analysis, where appropriate. Each section identifies which of the cumulative projects could contribute to a cumulative impact on that specific resource and why. Not all projects on the list apply to every cumulative analysis.

⁸ California Government Code section 53094.

Comment [PJ(2): Per 5/30 project team discussion, revise this to explain that City College trustees adopted their facilities master plan in March 2019. Give high level discussion of what's included in that master plan both in terms of projects and growth projections to the horizon year. Update figure to show those projects.

Briefly explain the status of CEQA review for those projects. Refer to:
-Agenda Item 10H for April 25 meeting for authorization to conduct CEQA:
<https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/ccsf/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=BAX6YJ7208A5>
-RFQ/P for the CEQA:
https://www.ccsf.edu/dam/Organizational_Assets/About_CCSF/Admin/facilities_planning/PlanningConstruction/ProfessionalServices/RFQP2019-238/RFQ-P%202019-238_FMP%20CEQA_Consultant_Final_%2003.21.2019.pdf

Briefly explain that this SEIR qualitatively assesses the cumulative impacts from the master plan because we don't in most instances have enough detail to conduct quantitative cumulative analysis.

Briefly explain that these projects may change to reflect funding changes, but we are using best available information, and mention potential bond measure about this issue. The last few trustee hearings about included this item, including the May 31 agenda.

TABLE 3.A-1
CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WITHIN A 0.5-MILE RADIUS OF THE PROJECT SITE

Map Key No.	Project Name (Case File No.)	Status as of February 2019	Dwelling Units	Commercial/Retail (gsf)	Community/Institutional (gsf)	Child Care (gsf)	Parking (spaces)
1	2340 San Jose Avenue (Upper Yard) (2017-012151PRJ)	Building permit issued	131	3,900	2,900	4,000	
2	2301 San Jose Avenue (Geneva Office Building – Geneva Car Barn and Powerhouse) (2012.0262E)	Under construction			19,882,900		
3	1601–1631 Ocean Avenue and 1271 Capitol Avenue (2009.1050ENV-03)	Under environmental review	54	5,869			
4	350 Ocean Avenue (2017-001961ENV)	Under environmental review	24	1,226			
5	City College – Performing Arts Center ^a				201,000		
6	City College – East Basin Parking Structure ^a				Unknown		877
Total^{b,c}			209	10,995	223,782	4,000	877

SOURCES: San Francisco Planning Department; 2019; City College of San Francisco, 2018.

NOTES:

^a City College is currently developing an update to the facilities master plan. City College identified the Performing Arts Center and East Basin Parking Lot as reasonably foreseeable projects that could overlap with the proposed project's construction timeframe. Both City College projects are anticipated to be under construction for 24 months from 2021 to 2023, and operational by 2023.

^b Transportation network improvements and development projects are not included in this table but are addressed in SEIR Section 3.B, Transportation and Circulation.

^c Smaller projects such as conversions and accessory dwelling units are not included within the 0.5-mile buffer.

Comment [PJ(3)]: I checked the 2018 Q4 pipeline and status of major projects on 4/15/19, and other than the edits, there's nothing to add.

Comment [PJ(4)]: Revise to one line listing City College all projects at Ocean campus.

Comment [PJ(5)]: Update City College source, e.g., 5/30/19 Board presentation, Project List Review.

Comment [PJ(6)]: Revise because they adopted their FMP.

Comment [WW(7)]: Confirm accuracy of deletion

Figure 3.A-1 Cumulative Projects within a 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site

Comment [PJ(8)]: Change title of figure to Cumulative Projects within a 0.5-Mile Radius of the Project Site